arXiv:1501.05027v3 [math.AC] 12 May 2015

ON STABLE DEGENERATIONS OF COHEN-MACAULAY MODULES OVER SIMPLE SINGULARITIES OF TYPE (A_n)

NAOYA HIRAMATSU

Dedicated to Professor Yuji Yoshino on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday.

Abstract. We study the stable degeneration problem for Cohen-Macaulay modules over simple singularities of type (A_n). We prove that the stable hom order is actually a partial order over the ring and are able to show that the stable degenerations can be controlled by the stable hom order.

1. Introduction

The concept of degenerations of modules introduced in representation theory for studying the structure of the module variety over a finite dimensional algebra [1, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17]. Classically Bongartz [1] investigated the degeneration problem of modules over an artinian algebra in relation with the Auslander-Reiten quiver. In [16], Zwara gave a complete description of degenerations of modules over representation finite algebras by using some order relations for modules known as the hom order, the degeneration order and the extension order. Now a theory of degenerations is considered for not only module categories, but derived categories [7] or stable categories [14], more generally, triangulated categories [10].

Let R be a commutative Gorenstein local k-algebra which is not necessary finite dimensional. Yoshino [14] introduced a notion of the stable analogue of degenerations of (maximal) Cohen-Macaulay R-module in the stable category $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. The notion of the stable degenerations is closely related to the ordinary degenerations. In fact, the author [4] give a complete description of degenerations of Cohen-Macaulay modules over a ring of even dimensional simple singularity of type (A_n) by using the description of stable degenerations over it. Hence it is also important for the study of degeneration problem to investigate the description of stable degenerations.

The purpose of this paper is to describe stable degenerations of Cohen-Macaulay modules over simple singularities of type (A_n).

$$k[[x_0, x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_d]]/(x_0^{n+1} + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \cdots + x_d^2).$$

First we compare Auslander-Reiten theory on $\mathrm{CM}(R)$ with that on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. We look into the relation between AR sequences and AR triangles of Cohen-Macaulay modules (Proposition 2.2). And we consider an order relation on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ which is the stable analogue of the hom order (Definition 2.6). We shall show that it is actually a partial order if a ring is of finite representation type with certain assumptions.

In Section 4, we devote to describe stable degenerations of Cohen-Macaulay modules over the ring above. We shall show that all stable degenerations can be controlled by the stable hom order (Theorem 4.6). To show this, we use the stable analogue of the argument over finite dimensional algebras in [16].

Date: May 13, 2015.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16W50 ; Secondary 13D10.

Key words and phrases. stable degeneration, Cohen-Macaulay module, stable category.

2. Stable hom order on Cohen-Macaulay modules

Throughout the paper R is a Henselian Gorenstein local ring that is k-algebra where k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0. For a finitely generated R-module M, we say that M is a Cohen-Macaulay R-module if

$$\operatorname{Ext}_R^i(M,R)=0 \quad \text{for any } i>0.$$

We denote by $\mathrm{CM}(R)$ the category of Cohen-Macaulay R-modules with all R-homomorphisms. And we also denote by $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ the stable category of $\mathrm{CM}(R)$. The objects of $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ are the same as those of $\mathrm{CM}(R)$, and the morphisms of $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ are elements of $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(M,N)=\mathrm{Hom}_R(M,N)/P(M,N)$ for $M,N\in\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$, where $P(M,N)$ denote the set of morphisms from M to N factoring through free R-modules. For a Cohen-Macaulay module M we denote it by $\underline{M}$ to indicate that it is an object of $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. For a finitely generated R-module M, take a free resolution

$$\cdots\to F_1\xrightarrow{d}F_0\to M\to 0.$$

We denote $\mathrm{Im}d$ by ΩM. We note that this defines the functor giving an auto-equivalence of $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. It is known that $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ has a structure of a triangulated category with the shift functor defined by the functor Ω^{-1}. We recommend the reader to [3, Chapter 1], [11, Section 4] for the detail. Since R is Gorenstein, by the definition of a triangle, $\underline{L}\to\underline{M}\to\underline{N}\to\underline{L}[1]$ is a triangle in $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ if and only if there is an exact sequence $0\to L\to M'\to N\to 0$ in $\mathrm{CM}(R)$ with $\underline{M'}\cong\underline{M}$ in $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$, that is, M' is isomorphic to M up to free summand. Since R is Henselian, $\mathrm{CM}(R)$, hence $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$, is a Krull-Schmidt category, namely each object can be decomposed into indecomposable objects up to isomorphism uniquely.

In the paper we use the theory of Auslander-Reiten (abbr. AR) sequences and triangles of Cohen-Macaulay modules. Let us recall the definitions of those notions. See [11] for AR sequences and [3, 8] for AR triangles.

Definition 2.1. Let X, Y and Z be Cohen-Macaulay R-modules.

(1) A short exact sequence $\Sigma_X : 0\to Z\to Y\xrightarrow{f}X\to 0$ is said to be an AR sequence ending in X (or starting from Z) if it satisfies
- (AR1) X and Z are indecomposable.
- (AR2) Σ_X is not split.
- (AR3) If $g:W\to X$ is not a split epimorphism, then there exists $h:W\to Y$ such that $g=f\circ h$.

(2) We also say that a triangle $\underline{\Sigma_X} : \underline{Z}\to\underline{Y}\xrightarrow{\underline{f}}\underline{X}\xrightarrow{\underline{w}}\underline{Z}[1]$ is an AR triangle ending in $\underline{X}$ (or starting from $\underline{Z}$) if it satisfies
- (ART1) $\underline{X}$ and $\underline{Z}$ are indecomposable.
- (ART2) $\underline{w}\neq 0$.
- (ART3) If $\underline{g}:\underline{W}\to\underline{X}$ is not a split epimorphism, then there exists $\underline{h}:\underline{W}\to\underline{Y}$ such that $\underline{g}=\underline{f}\circ\underline{h}$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\Sigma_X : 0\to Z\to Y\xrightarrow{f}X\to 0$ be an AR sequence ending in X. Then $\underline{\Sigma_X} : \underline{Z}\to\underline{Y}\xrightarrow{\underline{f}}\underline{X}\xrightarrow{\underline{w}}\underline{Z}[1]$ is an AR triangle ending in $\underline{X}$.*

Proof. We shall show that $\underline{\Sigma}$ satisfies (ART1), (ART2) and (ART3).
(ART1) It is obvious.
(ART2) If $\underline{w}$ is zero, then $\underline{\Sigma}$ is split. Thus there exists $\underline{g}:\underline{X}\to\underline{Y}$ such that $\underline{f}\circ\underline{g}=1_{\underline{X}}$. Note that $f\circ g\in\mathrm{radEnd}_R(X)$ since Σ is not split. It yields that $\underline{f}\circ\underline{g}=1_{\underline{X}}\in\mathrm{rad}\underline{\mathrm{End}}_R(X)$. This is a contradiction and $\underline{w}$ must be non zero.

(ART3) Let $\underline{g} : \underline{W} \to \underline{X}$ be not a split epimorphism. Then $g : W \to X$ is also not a split epimorphism. By (AR3), we have a morphism $h : W \to Y$ such that $f \circ h = g$. We conclude that $\underline{f} \circ \underline{h} = \underline{g}$. □

We say that $\mathrm{CM}(R)$ (resp. $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$) admits AR sequences (resp. AR triangles) if there exists an AR sequence (reap. AR triangle) ending in X (resp. $\underline{X}$) for each indecomposable Cohen-Macaulay R-module X. We also say that $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is an isolated singularity if each localization $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is regular for each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ with $\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{m}$. If R is an isolated singularity, $\mathrm{CM}(R)$ admits AR sequences (cf. [11, Theorem 3.2]). As a corollary of Proposition 2.2, $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ admits AR triangles if R is an isolated singularity.

Corollary 2.3. *If R is an isolated singularity, we have an 1-1 correspondence between the set of isomorphism classes of AR sequences in* $\mathrm{CM}(R)$ *and that of AR triangles in* $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$.

Proof. According to Proposition 2.2, we can define the mapping from the set of AR sequences to the set of AR triangles by taking its triangles. Note that AR triangles (resp. AR sequences) ending in $\underline{X}$ (resp. X) is unique up to isomorphism of triangles (resp. sequences) for a giving indecomposable $\underline{X}$ (resp. X) (see [3, 8]). Hence it follows from Proposition 2.2 that the mapping is surjective. The injectivity of the mapping is clear. □

For an AR triangle $\underline{Z} \to \underline{Y} \to \underline{X} \to \underline{Z}[1]$, we denote $\underline{Z}$ (resp. $\underline{X}$) by $\tau\underline{X}$ (resp. $\tau^{-1}\underline{Z}$). For an AR sequence $0 \to Z \to Y \to X \to 0$, Z (resp. X) is also denoted by τX (resp. $\tau^{-1}Z$) (see [11, Definition 2.8].). By virtue of Proposition 2.2, $\tau\underline{X} \cong \underline{\tau X}$ for each indecomposable Cohen-Macaulay R-module X.

Remark 2.4. Reiten and Van den Bergh[8] show that a Hom-finite k-linear triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$ admits AR triangles if and only if $\mathcal{T}$ has a Serre functor. We can show that $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ is a Hom-finite triangulated category which has a Serre functor if R is an isolated singularity. Actually $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ has a Serre functor $\underline{\tau(-)}[-1] \cong (-)[d-1]$ where $d = \dim R$. (Cf. [11, Lemma 3.10]. See also [6, Corollary 2.5.].) Here τ is an AR translation (see above). Therefore we can also show that $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ admits AR triangles by [8].

Lemma 2.5. [11, Lemma 3.9] *Let M and N be finitely generated R-modules. Then we have a functorial isomorphism*

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{M}, \underline{N}) \cong \mathrm{Tor}_1^R(\mathrm{Tr}M, N).$$

Here $\mathrm{Tr}M$ *is an Auslander transpose of M.*

According to Lemma 2.5, $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{M}, \underline{N})$ is of finite dimensional as a k-modules for M, $N \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$ if R is an isolated singularity. Thus the following definition makes sense.

Definition 2.6. For M, $N \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$ we define $\underline{M} \leq_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N}$ if $[\underline{X}, \underline{M}] \leq [\underline{X}, \underline{N}]$ for each $\underline{X} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. Here $[\underline{X}, \underline{M}]$ is an abbreviation of $\dim_k \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{X}, \underline{M})$.

Now let us consider the full subcategory of the functor category of $\mathrm{CM}(R)$ which is called the Auslander category. We give a brief review of the Auslander category (see [11, Chapter 4 and 13] for the detail). The Auslander category $\mathrm{mod}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$ is the category whose objects are finitely presented contravariant additive functors from $\mathrm{CM}(R)$ to the category of Abelian groups and whose morphisms are natural transformations between functors. The following lemma will be a key of our result in this section.

Lemma 2.7. [11, Theorem 13.7] *A group homomorphism*

$$\gamma : \mathrm{G}(\mathrm{CM}(R)) \to K_0(\mathrm{mod}(\mathrm{CM}(R))),$$

defined by $\gamma(M) = [\mathrm{Hom}_R(\ , M)]$ for $M \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$, is injective. Here $\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$ is a free Abelian group $\bigoplus \mathbb{Z}{\cdot}X$, where X runs through all isomorphism classes of indecomposable objects in $\mathrm{CM}(R)$.

We denote by $\underline{\mathrm{mod}}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$ the full subcategory $\mathrm{mod}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$ consisting of functors F with $F(R)=0$. Note that every object $F \in \underline{\mathrm{mod}}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$ is obtained from a short exact sequence in $\mathrm{CM}(R)$. Namely we have the short exact sequence $0 \to L \to M \to N \to 0$ such that

$$0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(\ ,L) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(\ ,M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(\ ,N) \to F \to 0$$

is exact in $\mathrm{mod}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$. Since $F \in \underline{\mathrm{mod}}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$ is a subfunctor $\mathrm{Ext}^1_R(\ ,L)$ for some $L \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$, $F(X)$ has finite length for each $X \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$ if R is an isolated singularity. Therefore we can define a group homomorphism associated with X in $\mathrm{CM}(R)$

$$\varphi_X : K_0(\underline{\mathrm{mod}}(\mathrm{CM}(R))) \to \mathbb{Z}\ ; \quad [F] \mapsto \dim_k F(X). \tag{2.1}$$

If $0 \to Z \to Y \to X \to 0$ is an AR sequence in $\mathrm{CM}(R)$, then the functor S_X defined by an exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(\ ,Z) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(\ ,Y) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(\ ,X) \to S_X \to 0$$

is a simple object in $\mathrm{mod}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$ and all the simple objects in $\mathrm{mod}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$ are obtained in this way from AR sequences. We say that R is of finite representation type if there are only a finite number of isomorphism classes of indecomposable Cohen-Macaulay R-modules. We note that if R is of finite representation type, then R is an isolated singularity (cf. [11, Chapter 3.]). It is proved in [11, (13.7.4)] that

for each object F in $\underline{\mathrm{mod}}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$, there is a filtration by subobjects $0 \subset F_1 \subset F_2 \subset \cdots \subset F_n = F$ such that each F_i/F_{i-1} is a simple object in $\mathrm{mod}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$ if R is of finite representation type.

We also remark that, since $\mathrm{CM}(R)$ is a Krull-Schmidt category,

$$S_X(Y) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } X \cong Y, \\ 0 & \text{if } X \ncong Y. \end{cases}$$

for an indecomposable module $Y \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$. See [11, (4.11)] for instance.

Lemma 2.8. *If R is of finite representation type, then we have the equality in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{mod}}(\mathrm{CM}(R)))$*

$$[\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(-,\underline{M})] = \sum_{X_i \in \mathrm{indCM}(R)} [\underline{X_i},\underline{M}] \cdot [S_{X_i}]$$

for each $M \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$.

Proof. For $F = \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(-,\underline{M})$, $F(R)=0$, so that $F \in \underline{\mathrm{mod}}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$. Since R is of finite representation type, F has a filtration by simple objects S_{X_i} (see above). Hence we have the equality in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{mod}}(\mathrm{CM}(R)))$:

$$[F] = \sum_{X_i \in \mathrm{indCM}(R)} c_i \cdot [S_{X_i}].$$

By using homomorphism in (2.1), we see that

$$[\underline{X_j},\underline{M}] = \varphi_{X_j}([F]) = \dim_k \sum_{X_i \in \mathrm{indCM}(R)} c_i \cdot \dim_k S_{X_i}(X_j) = c_j.$$

Therefore we obtain the equation in the lemma. $\square$

Theorem 2.9. *Let R be of finite representation type and M and N be Cohen-Macaulay R-modules. Suppose that $[\underline{X},\underline{M}] = [\underline{X},\underline{N}]$ for each $\underline{X} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. Then $\underline{M} \oplus \underline{\Omega M} \cong \underline{N} \oplus \underline{\Omega N}$.*

Proof. Under the circumstances, we see that $[\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(-,\underline{M})] = [\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(-,\underline{N})]$ in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{mod}}(\mathrm{CM}(R)))$, hence in $K_0(\mathrm{mod}(\mathrm{CM}(R)))$. Note that $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(-,\underline{M}) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^1_R(-,\Omega M)$ for each $M \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$ (cf. [2]). We have the resolution in $\mathrm{mod}(\mathrm{CM}(R))$:

$$0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(-,\Omega M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(-,P_M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(-,M) \to \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(-,\underline{M}) \to 0,$$

where P_M is a free R-module. Thus we have

$$[\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,M)]+[\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,\Omega M)]-[\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,P_M)] = [\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,N)]+[\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,\Omega N)]-[\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,P_N)].$$

Hence,

$$[\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,M)]+[\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,\Omega M)]+[\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,P_N)] = [\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,N)]+[\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,\Omega N)]+[\mathrm{Hom}_R(-,P_M)].$$

According to Lemma 2.7, we get

$$M \oplus \Omega M \oplus P_N \cong N \oplus \Omega N \oplus P_M.$$

Therefore $\underline{M} \oplus \underline{\Omega M} \cong \underline{N} \oplus \underline{\Omega N}$. □

It immediately follows from the theorem that

Corollary 2.10. *Let R be of finite representation type and M and N be Cohen-Macaulay R-modules. Suppose that $\underline{U} \cong \underline{U}[-1]$ for each indecomposable Cohen-Macaulay R-module U. Then $[\underline{X},\underline{M}] = [\underline{X},\underline{N}]$ for each $\underline{X} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ if and only if $\underline{M} \cong \underline{N}$. Particularly, $\leq_{\underline{hom}}$ is a partial order on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$.*

Example 2.11. Let R be a one dimensional simple singularity of type (A_n), that is $R = k[[x,y]]/(x^{n+1}+y^2)$. If n is an even integer, one can show that X is isomorphic to ΩX up to free summed for each $X \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$, so that $\underline{X} \cong \underline{X}[-1]$. See [11, Proposition 5.11]. Thus $\leq_{\underline{hom}}$ is a partial order on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ if n is an even integer.

If n is an odd integer, we have indecomposable modules $X \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$ such that $\underline{X} \ncong \underline{X}[-1]$. In fact, let $N_{\pm} = R/(x^{(n+1)/2} \pm \sqrt{-1}y)$. Then N_+ (resp. N_-) is isomorphic to ΩN_- (resp. ΩN_+), so that $\underline{N_+} \ncong \underline{N_+}[-1]$ (resp. $\underline{N_-} \ncong \underline{N_-}[-1]$). Although we can also show that $\leq_{\underline{hom}}$ is a partial order on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ even if n is an odd integer.

Proposition 2.12. *Let $R = k[[x,y]]/(x^{n+1}+y^2)$. Then $[\underline{X},\underline{M}] = [\underline{X},\underline{N}]$ for each $\underline{X} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ if and only if $\underline{M} \cong \underline{N}$.*

Proof. We show the case when n is an odd integer. Let $I_i = (x^i, y)$ be ideals of R for $1 \leq i \leq (n-1)/2$ and $N_{\pm} = R/(x^{(n+1)/2} \pm \sqrt{-1}y)$. Then $\{I_1, \cdots I_{(n-1)/2}, N_{\pm}\}$ is a complete list of non free indecomposable Cohen-Macaulay R-modules. Note that $I_i \cong \Omega I_i$ up to free summand for $i = 1, \cdots (n-1)/2$. See [11, Paragraph (9.9)]. Now let M, $N \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$ and suppose that $[\underline{X},\underline{M}] = [\underline{X},\underline{N}]$ for each $\underline{X} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. Set $\underline{M} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{(n-1)/2} \underline{I_i}^{m_i} \oplus \underline{N_+}^{m_+} \oplus \underline{N_-}^{m_-}$ and $\underline{N} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{(n-1)/2} \underline{I_i}^{n_i} \oplus \underline{N_+}^{n_+} \oplus \underline{N_-}^{n_-}$. By Theorem 2.9, $\underline{M} \oplus \underline{\Omega M} \cong \underline{N} \oplus \underline{\Omega N}$. Thus

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{(n-1)/2} \underline{I_i}^{2m_i} \oplus \underline{N_+}^{m_+ + m_-} \oplus \underline{N_-}^{m_+ + m_-} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{(n-1)/2} \underline{I_i}^{2n_i} \oplus \underline{N_+}^{n_+ + n_-} \oplus \underline{N_-}^{n_+ + n_-}.$$

Hence we have equalities:

$$m_i = n_i, \quad m_+ + m_- = n_+ + n_-.$$

Here we remark that

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{N_\pm}, \underline{N_\mp}) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^1_R(N_\pm, N_\pm) = 0.$$

Using this, we have

$$[\underline{N_+},\underline{M}] = \sum_{i=1}^{(n-1)/2} m_i[\underline{N_+},\underline{I_i}] + m_+[\underline{N_+},\underline{N_+}] = \sum_{i=1}^{(n-1)/2} n_i[\underline{N_+},\underline{I_i}] + n_+[\underline{N_+},\underline{N_+}] = [\underline{N_+},\underline{N}].$$

This equality show that $m_+ = n_+$, so that $m_- = n_-$. Consequently $\underline{M} \cong \underline{N}$. □

Remark 2.13. The stable hom order $\leq_{\underline{hom}}$ is not always a partial order on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ even if the base ring R is a simple singularity of type (A_n). Let $R = k[[x,y,z]]/(x^3+y^2+z^2)$. Then R is a two dimensional simple singularity of type (A_2). And let I (resp. J) be an ideal generated by (x,y) (resp. (x^2,y)). Note that the set $\{I, J\}$ is a complete list of non free indecomposable Cohen-Macaulay R-modules (see [11, Chapter 10] for instance). Then it is easy to see that $[\underline{I},\underline{J}] = [\underline{J},\underline{I}] = 1$. However $\underline{I} \ncong \underline{J}$. Thus $\leq_{\underline{hom}}$ is not a partial order on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$.

In what follows, we always assume that R is an isolated singularity. We denote by $\mu(\underline{M},\underline{Z})$ the multiplicity of $\underline{Z}$ as a direct summand of $\underline{M}$. On an AR triangle, we have the following.

Proposition 2.14. *Let $\underline{\Sigma_X} : \underline{Z} \to \underline{Y} \to \underline{X} \to \underline{Z}[1]$ be an AR triangle in $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. Then the following statements hold for each $U \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$.*

1. $[\underline{U},\underline{X}] + [\underline{U},\underline{Z}] - [\underline{U},\underline{Y}] = \mu(\underline{U},\underline{X}) + \mu(\underline{U},\underline{X}[-1])$.
2. *If $\underline{U}$ is periodic of period 2, that is, $\underline{U} \cong \underline{U}[2]$, then*
$$[\underline{U},\underline{X}] + [\underline{U},\underline{Z}] - [\underline{U},\underline{Y}] = [\underline{U}[-1],\underline{X}] + [\underline{U}[-1],\underline{Z}] - [\underline{U}[-1],\underline{Y}]$$

Proof. (1) Apply $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},-)$ to the triangle $\underline{\Sigma_X}$, we have a long exact sequence as follows:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{Z}[-1]) \arrow[r] & \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{Y}[-1]) \arrow[r, "\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U}{,}\underline{g}[-1])"] & \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{X}[-1]) \arrow[r] & {} \\
\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{Z}) \arrow[r, "\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U}{,}\underline{f})"] & \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{Y}) \arrow[r, "\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{M}{,}\underline{g})"] & \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{X}) \arrow[r] & {} \\
\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{Z}[1]) \arrow[r, "\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U}{,}\underline{f}[1])"] & \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{Y}[1]) \arrow[r] & \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{X}[1]) \arrow[r] & {} .
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since $\underline{\mathrm{End}}_R(\underline{X})/\mathrm{rad}\underline{\mathrm{End}}_R(\underline{X}) \cong k$ for each non free indecomposable Cohen-Macaulay module X and by the property of an AR triangle (ART3), we have

$$\mathrm{Ker}\ \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{f}[i+1]) \cong \mathrm{Coker}\ \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{g}[i]) \cong k^{\mu(\underline{U},\underline{X}[i])}$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular

$$0 \to k^{\mu(\underline{U},\underline{X}[-1])} \to \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{Z}) \to \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{Y}) \to \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(\underline{U},\underline{X}) \to k^{\mu(\underline{U},\underline{X})} \to 0$$

Therefore we obtain the required equation.

(2) Note from (1) that the equations

$$[\underline{U},\underline{X}] + [\underline{U},\underline{Z}] - [\underline{U},\underline{Y}] = \mu(\underline{U},\underline{X}) + \mu(\underline{U},\underline{X}[-1])$$

and

$$[\underline{U}[-1],\underline{X}] + [\underline{U}[-1],\underline{Z}] - [\underline{U}[-1],\underline{Y}] = \mu(\underline{U}[-1],\underline{X}) + \mu(\underline{U}[-1],\underline{X}[-1])$$

hold. Since the shift functor $(-)[1]$ (hence $(-)[-1]$) is an auto functor, $\mu(\underline{U},\underline{X}) = \mu(\underline{U}[-1],\underline{X}[-1])$. Moreover $\mu(\underline{U}[-1],\underline{X}) = \mu(\underline{U},\underline{X}[-1])$ for $\underline{U}[-1][-1] \cong \underline{U}[-2] \cong \underline{U}$. Consequently we get the assertion. ☐

Remark 2.15. By using Proposition 2.14, one can show that $\leq_{\underline{hom}}$ is a partial order on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ without the assumption that R is of finite representation type.

3. Hom order and Grothendieck group of $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$

For later reference we state some results on the stable hom order among the same class in the Grothendieck group of $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. The Grothendieck group of $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ (more generally a triangulated category) is defined by

$$K_0(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)) = \mathrm{G}(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))/ < \underline{X} + \underline{Z} - \underline{Y} \ |\text{There is a triangle } \underline{Z} \to \underline{Y} \to \underline{X} \to \underline{Z}[1] \text{ in } \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R) >,$$

where $\mathrm{G}(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$ is a free Abelian group $\bigoplus_{\underline{X} \in \mathrm{ind}\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)} \mathbb{Z} \cdot \underline{X}$. We refer the reader to [3, Chapter 3] for the details. Since R is Gorenstein, one can show that $[\underline{M}] = [\underline{N}]$ in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$ if and only if $[M \oplus P] = [N \oplus Q]$ in $K_0(\mathrm{CM}(R))$ for some free R-modules P, Q.

Lemma 3.1. *If R is of finite representation type, we have the equality as a subgroup of* $\mathrm{G}(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$*:*

$$\begin{aligned}&< \underline{X}+\underline{Z}-\underline{Y} \mid \text{There is a triangle } \underline{Z}\to\underline{Y}\to\underline{X}\to\underline{Z}[1] \text{ in } \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R) > \\ &=< \underline{X}+\underline{Z}-\underline{Y} \mid \text{There is an AR triangle } \underline{Z}\to\underline{Y}\to\underline{X}\to\underline{Z}[1] \text{ in } \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R) > .\end{aligned}$$

Proof. It follows from Corollary 2.3, [11, Theorem 13.7] and the definition of triangles in stable categories. □

Hence, if R is of finite representation type, $[\underline{M}]=[\underline{N}]$ in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$ if and only if there exist AR triangles $\underline{Z_i}\to\underline{Y_i}\to\underline{X_i}\to\underline{Z_i}[1]$ and $\underline{Z'_j}\to\underline{Y'_j}\to\underline{X'_j}\to\underline{Z'_j}[1]$ with the equality

$$[\underline{M}]-[\underline{N}]=\sum_i^n c_i\cdot([\underline{X_i}]+[\underline{Z_i}]-[\underline{Y_i}])-\sum_j^m d_j\cdot([\underline{X'_j}]+[\underline{Z'_j}]-[\underline{Y'_j}]). \tag{3.1}$$

Now we consider the following condition:

(∗) For an AR triangle $\underline{Z}\to\underline{Y}\to\underline{X}\to\underline{Z}[1]$, $[\underline{X}]+[\underline{Z}]-[\underline{Y}]=[\underline{X}[-1]]+[\underline{Z}[-1]]-[\underline{Y}[-1]]$ in $\mathrm{G}(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$.

Remark 3.2.

1. The condition (∗) says that for AR triangles $\underline{Z}\to\underline{Y}\to\underline{X}\to\underline{Z}[1]$ and $\underline{Z'}\to\underline{Y'}\to\underline{X'}\to\underline{Z'}[1]$, if $[\underline{U},\underline{X}]+[\underline{U},\underline{Z}]-[\underline{U},\underline{Y}]=[\underline{U},\underline{X'}]+[\underline{U},\underline{Z'}]-[\underline{U},\underline{Y'}]$ for each indecomposable $\underline{U}$ then $[\underline{X}]+[\underline{Z}]-[\underline{Y}]=[\underline{X'}]+[\underline{Z'}]-[\underline{Y'}]$ in $\mathrm{G}(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$. Since it follows from Proposition 2.14 that $\mu(\underline{X},\underline{X})+\mu(\underline{X},\underline{X}[-1])=\mu(\underline{X},\underline{X'})+\mu(\underline{X},\underline{X'}[-1])$, we see that $\underline{X}\cong\underline{X'}$ or $\underline{X}\cong\underline{X'}[-1]$. If $\underline{X}\cong\underline{X'}$ the equation is obvious and assume that $\underline{X}\cong\underline{X'}[-1]$. Then by (∗),
$$\begin{aligned}[\underline{X}]+[\underline{Z}]-[\underline{Y}] &= [\underline{X'}[-1]]+[\underline{Z'}[-1]]-[\underline{Y'}[-1]]\\ &= [\underline{X'}]+[\underline{Z'}]-[\underline{Y'}]\end{aligned}$$
in $\mathrm{G}(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$.
2. We also remark that, under the condition (∗), $\underline{X}\cong\underline{X}[-1]$ holds if $\underline{X}\cong\tau\underline{X}$. For an AR triangle $\underline{\Sigma_X}:\tau\underline{X}\to\underline{E_X}\to\underline{X}\to\tau\underline{X}[1]$, we have
$$\underline{X}\oplus\tau\underline{X}\oplus\underline{E_X}[-1]\cong\underline{X}[-1]\oplus\tau\underline{X}[-1]\oplus\underline{E_X}.$$
Assume that $\underline{X}\ncong\underline{X}[-1]$. Then $\underline{X}\oplus\tau\underline{X}\cong\underline{E_X}$. However, this never happen (see Proposition 2.14).
3. The condition (∗) holds when $R=k[[x,y]]/(x^{n+1}+y^2)$ (cf. [11, Proposition 5.11, Paragraph (9.9)]).

Proposition 3.3. *Let R be of finite representation type and M and N be Cohen-Macaulay R-modules with $[\underline{M}]=[\underline{N}]$ in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$. Suppose that each AR triangle satisfies the condition (∗). Then $\underline{M}\le_{hom}\underline{N}$ if and only if there exist AR triangles $\underline{Z_i}\to\underline{Y_i}\to\underline{X_i}\to\underline{Z_i}[1]$ with the equation*

$$[\underline{M}]-[\underline{N}]=\sum_i^n c_i\cdot([\underline{X_i}]+[\underline{Z_i}]-[\underline{Y_i}]) \tag{3.2}$$

in $\mathrm{G}(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$.

Proof. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}[\underline{U},\underline{N}]-[\underline{U},\underline{M}] &= \textstyle\sum_i^n c_i\cdot([\underline{U},\underline{X_i}]+[\underline{U},\underline{Z_i}]-[\underline{U},\underline{Y_i}])-\sum_j^m d_j\cdot([\underline{U},\underline{X'_j}]+[\underline{U},\underline{Z'_j}]-[\underline{U},\underline{Y'_j}])\\ &= \textstyle\sum_i^n c_i\cdot\{\mu(\underline{U},\underline{X_i})+\mu(\underline{U},\underline{X_i}[-1])\}-\sum_j^m d_j\cdot\{\mu(\underline{U},\underline{X'_j})+\mu(\underline{U},\underline{X'_j}[-1])\}\end{aligned}$$

for each indecomposable module $U\in\mathrm{CM}(R)$. Assume that $\underline{M}\le_{hom}\underline{N}$. If $d_j\neq 0$, there exist i such that $\underline{X'_j}\cong\underline{X_i}$ or $\underline{X'_j}[-1]\cong\underline{X_i}$ with $d_j=c_i$. As mentioned in Remark 3.2(1), by the condition (∗), we can omit such constituents in the expression. Repeating this procedure, we obtain the equation. □

Under the circumstance of Proposition 3.3, we say that the expression (3.2) is irredundant if each $\underline{X_i}$ is not isomorphic to each other up to a shift. Since R is of finite representation type, we can always take the expression irredundant. We say that R satisfies $(*)$ if each AR triangle satisfies the condition $(*)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let R be of finite representation type which satisfies $(*)$ and M and N be Cohen-Macaulay R-modules with $\underline{M} \leq_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N}$ and $[\underline{M}] = [\underline{N}]$ in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$. And let U be a non free and indecomposable direct summand of N. Suppose that $[\underline{U}, \underline{M}] = [\underline{U}, \underline{N}]$ and $\underline{U} \cong \underline{U}[2]$. Then U is also a direct summand of M.*

Proof. By virtue of Proposition 3.3, since $\underline{M} \leq_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N}$, there exist AR triangles $\underline{Z_i} \to \underline{Y_i} \to \underline{X_i} \to \underline{Z_i}[1]$ with

$$[\underline{N}] - [\underline{M}] = \sum_i^n c_i \cdot ([\underline{X_i}] + [\underline{Z_i}] - [\underline{Y_i}])$$

in $\mathrm{G}(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$. Thus we have

$$\underline{N} \oplus \bigoplus_i^n \underline{Y_i}^{c_i} \cong \underline{M} \oplus \bigoplus_i^n (\underline{X_i} \oplus \underline{Z_i})^{c_i}.$$

Now we assume that U is not a direct summand of M. Then there exists i such that $\underline{U} \cong \underline{X_i}$ or $\underline{U} \cong \underline{Z_i}$ and we can show the inequality

$$[\underline{U}, \underline{X_i}] + [\underline{U}, \underline{Z_i}] - [\underline{U}, \underline{Y_i}] = \mu(\underline{U}, \underline{X}) + \mu(\underline{U}, \underline{X}[-1]) > 0$$

holds. If $\underline{U} \cong \underline{X_i}$, it is clear. If $\underline{U} \cong \underline{Z_i}$, since $\underline{U}$ is periodic of period at most 2,

$$\underline{X_i} \cong \tau^{-1}\underline{U} \cong \underline{U}[d] \cong \underline{U} \text{ or } \underline{U}[1].$$

See Remark 2.4. Hence we have the inequality above. However the inequality never happen since

$$[\underline{U}, \bigoplus_i \underline{Y_i}^{c_i}] = [\underline{U}, \bigoplus_i (\underline{X_i} \oplus \underline{Z_i})^{c_i}].$$

Therefore, U is a direct summand of M. □

Proposition 3.5. *Let R be of finite representation type which satisfies $(*)$ and M and N be Cohen-Macaulay R-modules with $\underline{M} \leq_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N}$ and $[\underline{M}] = [\underline{N}]$ in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$. Suppose that $[\underline{U}, \underline{M}] = [\underline{U}, \underline{N}]$ and $\underline{U} \cong \underline{U}[2]$ for each indecomposable direct summand U of N. Then $\underline{M} \cong \underline{N}$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.4 that $\underline{N}$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\underline{M}$. Since $\underline{M} \leq_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N}$, we have $\underline{M} \cong \underline{N}$. □

4. Stable degenerations of Cohen-Macaulay modules

In this section, we shall describe the stable degenerations of Cohen-Macaulay modules over simple singularities over type (A_n), namely

$$k[[x_0, x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_d]]/(x_0^{n+1} + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \cdots + x_d^2). \tag{4.1}$$

First let us recall the definition of stable degenerations of Cohen-Macaulay modules.

Definition 4.1. [14, Definition 4.1] Let $\underline{M}, \underline{N} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. We say that $\underline{M}$ stably degenerates to $\underline{N}$ if there exists a Cohen-Macaulay module $\underline{Q} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R \otimes_k V)$ such that $\underline{Q[1/t]} \cong \underline{M \otimes_k K}$ in $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R \otimes_k K)$ and $\underline{Q \otimes_V V/tV} \cong \underline{N}$ in $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$.

It is known that the ring (4.1) is of finite representation type, so that it is an isolated singularity. If a ring is an isolated singularity, there is a nice characterization of stable degenerations.

Theorem 4.2. [14, Theorem 5.1, 6.1] *Consider the following three conditions for Cohen-Macaulay R-modules M and N:*

1. *$M \oplus P$ degenerates to $N \oplus Q$ for some free R-modules P, Q.*
2. *$\underline{M}$ stably degenerates to $\underline{N}$.*
3. *There is a triangle*
$$\underline{Z} \longrightarrow \underline{M} \oplus \underline{Z} \longrightarrow \underline{N} \longrightarrow \underline{Z}[1]$$
in $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$.

If R is an isolated singularity, then (2) *and* (3) *are equivalent. Moreover, if R is artinian, the conditions* (1), (2) *and* (3) *are equivalent.*

Remark 4.3. In general, the implications (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) hold. And it is required that the endmorphism of $\underline{Z}$ in the triangle in (3) is nilpotent. However if R is an isolated singularity, we do not need the nilpotency assumption (cf. [14, Lemma 6.5.]). The theorem also says that $\underline{M}$ and $\underline{N}$ give the same class in the Grothendieck group of $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ if $\underline{M}$ stably degenerates to $\underline{N}$.

We state order relations with respect to stable degenerations and triangles.

Definition 4.4. [4, Definition 3.2., 3.3.] Let M and N be Cohen-Macaulay R-modules.

1. We denote by $\underline{M} \leq_{st} \underline{N}$ if $\underline{N}$ is obtained from $\underline{M}$ by iterative stable degenerations, i.e. there is a sequence of Cohen-Macaulay R-modules $\underline{L_0}, \underline{L_1}, \dots, \underline{L_r}$ such that $\underline{M} \cong \underline{L_0}$, $\underline{N} \cong \underline{L_r}$ and each $\underline{L_i}$ stably degenerates to $\underline{L_{i+1}}$ for $0 \leq i < r$.
2. We say that $\underline{M}$ stably degenerates by a triangle to $\underline{N}$, if there is a triangle of the form $\underline{U} \to \underline{M} \to \underline{V} \to \underline{U}[1]$ in $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ such that $\underline{U} \oplus \underline{V} \cong \underline{N}$. We also denote by $\underline{M} \leq_{tri} \underline{N}$ if $\underline{N}$ is obtain from $\underline{M}$ by iterative stable degenerations by a triangle.

Remark 4.5. It has shown in [14] that the stable degeneration order is a partial order. Moreover if there is a triangle $\underline{U} \to \underline{M} \to \underline{V} \to \underline{U}[1]$, then we can show that $\underline{M}$ stably degenerates to $\underline{U} \oplus \underline{V}$ (cf. [4, Remark 3.4. (2)]). Hence $\underline{M} \leq_{tri} \underline{N}$ induces $\underline{M} \leq_{st} \underline{N}$. It also follows from Theorem 4.2 that $\underline{M} \leq_{st} \underline{N}$ induces that $\underline{M} \leq_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N}$.

The rest of the paper, we devote to describe stable degenerations over the one dimensional simple singularity of type (A_n). Namely we consider the ring of the form:

$$R = k[[x, y]]/(x^{n+1} + y^2).$$

As stated in [11, Proposition 5.11], if n is an even integer, the set of ideals of R

$$\{\ I_i = (x^i, y) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n/2\ \}$$

is a complete list of isomorphic indecomposable non free Cohen-Macaulay R-modules. On the other hand, if n is an odd integer, then

$$\{\ I_i = (x^i, y) \mid 1 \leq i \leq (n-1)/2\ \} \cup \{\ N_+ = R/(x^{(n+1)/2} + \sqrt{-1}y),\ N_- = R/(x^{(n+1)/2} - \sqrt{-1}y)\ \}$$

is a complete list of the ones (cf. [11, Paragraph (9.9)]).

In this section, we shall show

Theorem 4.6. *Let $R = k[[x, y]]/(x^{n+1} + y^2)$. Then the stable hom order coincides with the stable degeneration order. Particularly, we have the followings.*

1. *If n is an even integer,*
$$\underline{0} \leq_{st} \underline{I_1} \leq_{st} \underline{I_2} \leq_{st} \cdots \leq_{st} \underline{I_{n/2}}.$$

(2) *If n is an odd integer,*

$$\underline{0} \leq_{st} \underline{I_1} \leq_{st} \underline{I_2} \leq_{st} \cdots \leq_{st} \underline{I_{(n-1)/2}} \leq_{st} \underline{N_+} \oplus \underline{N_-}.$$

and

$$\underline{N_\pm} \leq_{st} \underline{N_\pm} \oplus \underline{I_1} \leq_{st} \cdots \leq_{st} \underline{N_\pm} \oplus \underline{I_{(n-1)/2}} \leq_{st} \underline{N_\pm} \oplus \underline{N_+} \oplus \underline{N_-} \quad \textit{(double sign corresponds).}$$

To show this, we use the stable analogue of the argument in [16].

The lemma below is well known for the case in an Abelian category (cf. [16, Lemma 2.6]). The same statement follows in an arbitrary k-linear triangulated category, not necessary $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. (The author thanks Yuji Yoshino for telling me this argument.)

Lemma 4.7. *Let*

$$\Sigma_1 : N_1 \xrightarrow{\binom{f_1}{v}} L_1 \oplus N_2 \xrightarrow{(u,g_1)} L_2 \longrightarrow N_1[1]$$

and

$$\Sigma_2 : M_1 \xrightarrow{\binom{f_2}{w}} N_1 \oplus M_2 \xrightarrow{(v,g_2)} N_2 \longrightarrow M_1[1]$$

be triangles in a k-linear triangulated category. Then we also have the following triangle.

$$M_1 \to L_1 \oplus M_2 \to L_2 \to M_1[1].$$

Proof. We consider the following triangle associated with Σ_2:

$$M_1 \xrightarrow{\left(\begin{smallmatrix}-f_1\circ f_2\\ f_2\\ w\end{smallmatrix}\right)} L_1 \oplus N_1 \oplus M_2 \xrightarrow{\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1 & f_1 & 0\\ 0 & v & g_2\end{smallmatrix}\right)} N_2 \longrightarrow M_1[1].$$

We remark that the left morphism is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix}-f_1\circ f_2\\ f_2\\ w\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}1 & -f_1 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}0\\ f_2\\ w\end{pmatrix},$$

to make the diagram below:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N_1 \arrow[r, "\binom{f_1}{v}"] \arrow[d, equal] & L_1 \oplus N_2 \arrow[r, "(u,g_1)"] & L_2 \arrow[r] & N_1[1] \arrow[d, equal] \\
N_1 \arrow[r, "\left(\begin{smallmatrix}0\\1\\0\end{smallmatrix}\right)"'] & L_1 \oplus N_1 \oplus M_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[u, "\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1 & f_1 & 0\\ 0 & v & g_2\end{smallmatrix}\right)"'] & L_1 \oplus M_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[u] & N_1[1] \\
 & M_1 \arrow[u, "\left(\begin{smallmatrix}-f_1\circ f_2\\ f_2\\ w\end{smallmatrix}\right)"'] \arrow[r, equal] & M_1. \arrow[u] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

By the octahedral axiom, we obtain the required triangle. □

Remark 4.8. Combining (the Abelian version of) Lemma 4.7 with Lemma 2.8, the dimension of $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}$ can be calculate easily from datum of AR sequences. For instance, let $R = k[[x,y]]/(x^{n+1}+y^2)$ where n is even. The AR sequences are

$$0 \to I_i \to I_{i-1} \oplus I_{i+1} \to I_i \to 0$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, n/2$ where $I_0 = R$ and $I_{n/2+1} \cong I_{n/2}$. Then we have

$$\begin{tikzcd}
I_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & I_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \cdots \arrow[r] & I_{n/2} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & I_{n/2} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \cdots \arrow[r] & I_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & R \arrow[d] \\
R \arrow[r] & I_1 \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & I_{n/2-1} \arrow[r] & I_{n/2+1} \cong I_{n/2} \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & I_2 \arrow[r] & I_1.
\end{tikzcd}$$

The diagram shows that

$$[\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_R(-, \underline{I_1})] = \sum 2[S_{I_i}]$$

in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{mod}}(\mathrm{CM}(R)))$. Thus we obtain $[\underline{I_i}, \underline{I_1}] = 2$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n/2$.

Definition 4.9. Let M and N be Cohen-Macaulay R-modules. We define a function $\delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(-)$ on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ by

$$\delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(-) = [-, \underline{N}] - [-, \underline{M}].$$

For a triangle $\underline{\Sigma} : \underline{L} \to \underline{M} \to \underline{N} \to \underline{L}[1]$, we also define a function $\delta_{\underline{\Sigma}}(-)$ on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ by

$$\delta_{\underline{\Sigma}}(-) = [-, \underline{L}] + [-, \underline{N}] - [-, \underline{M}].$$

Remark 4.10. As mentioned in Proposition 3.3, for modules M, $N \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$ with $\underline{M} \leq_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N}$ and $[\underline{M}] = [\underline{N}]$ in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$, we have the irredundant expression

$$[\underline{M}] - [\underline{N}] = \sum_i^n c_i \cdot ([\underline{X_i}] + [\underline{Z_i}] - [\underline{Y_i}]),$$

where $\underline{\Sigma_{X_i}} : \underline{Z_i} \to \underline{Y_i} \to \underline{X_i} \to \underline{Z_i}[1]$ are AR triangles. On the number c_i, it is easy to see that

$$c_i = \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X_i)/\delta_{\underline{\Sigma_{X_i}}}(X_i)$$

holds.

We say that a triangle $\underline{Z} \xrightarrow{g} \underline{Y} \xrightarrow{f} \underline{X} \to \underline{Z}[1]$ is without isomorphisms if $\underline{f} \in \underline{\mathrm{rad}}(\underline{Y}, \underline{X})$ and $\underline{g} \in \underline{\mathrm{rad}}(\underline{Z}, \underline{Y})$. Let $\underline{Z} \to \underline{Y} \to \underline{X} \to \underline{Z}[1]$ be any triangle. As in the same case of a sequence, there is a triangle without isomorphisms $\underline{Z'} \to \underline{Y'} \to \underline{X'} \to \underline{Z'}[1]$ for such that $\underline{Z} \cong \underline{Z'} \oplus \underline{U}$, $\underline{Y} \cong \underline{Y'} \oplus \underline{U} \oplus \underline{V}$ and $\underline{X} \cong \underline{X'} \oplus \underline{V}$ for some $\underline{U}$, $\underline{V} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. (Cf. [16, Paragraph (2.7)]).

Lemma 4.11. [16, Lemma 3.1.] *Let R be of finite representation type which satisfies $(*)$ and let M and N be Cohen-Macaulay R-modules with $\underline{M} \leq_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N}$ and $[\underline{M}] = [\underline{N}]$ in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$. Let $\underline{\Sigma} : \underline{U} \to \underline{W} \to \underline{V} \to \underline{U}[1]$ be a triangle without isomorphisms such that $\delta_{\underline{\Sigma}} \leq \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}$. Suppose that $\underline{X} \cong \underline{X}[2]$ for each indecomposable $\underline{X} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. Then there exists a triangle $\underline{\Phi} : \underline{Z} \to \underline{Y} \to \underline{V} \to \underline{Z}[1]$ without isomorphisms such that $\delta_{\underline{\Phi}}(Y) = \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(Y)$.*

Proof. If $\delta_{\underline{\Sigma}}(\underline{W}) = \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(\underline{W})$, we have nothing to prove. Otherwise, we assume that there exists an indecomposable direct summand W_1 of W $(= W_1 \oplus W_2)$ such that $\delta_{\underline{\Sigma}}(W_1) < \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(W_1)$. Under the assumptions, we have AR triangles $\underline{\Sigma_{X_i}} : \tau\underline{X_i} \to \underline{E_{X_i}} \to \underline{X_i} \to \tau\underline{X_i}[1]$ such that $\delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}} = \sum_i c_i \cdot \delta_{\underline{\Sigma_{X_i}}}$. (See Proposition 3.3.) Thus there exists i such that $\delta_{\underline{\Sigma_{X_i}}}(W_1) > 0$. This yields that $\underline{W_1} \cong \underline{X_i}$ or $\underline{W_1} \cong \underline{X_i}[-1]$. Since each $\underline{X} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ is periodic of period at most 2, by Proposition 2.14, $\delta_{\underline{\Sigma_{X_i}}} = \delta_{\underline{\Sigma_{X_i[-1]}}}$. Hence we have $\delta_{\underline{\Sigma_{X_i}}} = \delta_{\underline{\Sigma_{W_1}}}$ for the AR triangle $\underline{\Sigma_{W_1}}$ of $\underline{W_1}$.

Let $\underline{f}$ be the morphism $\underline{U} \to \underline{W_1}$ in the triangle $\underline{\Sigma}$. Take the AR triangle $\underline{\Sigma_{W_1}}$ of $\underline{W_1}$ and construct a pullback diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\tau\underline{W_1} \arrow[r] & \underline{E_{W_1}} \arrow[r] & \underline{W_1} \arrow[r] & \tau\underline{W_1}[1] \\
\tau\underline{W_1} \arrow[r] \arrow[u, equal] & \underline{E} \arrow[r] \arrow[u] & \underline{U} \arrow[r] \arrow[u, "\underline{f}"'] & \tau\underline{W_1}[1]. \arrow[u, equal]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since $\underline{\Sigma}$ is without isomorphisms, $\underline{f}$ is not isomorphism. By the property of an AR triangle (ART3), the bottom triangle splits, so that $\underline{E} \cong \underline{U} \oplus \tau\underline{W_1}$. Then we have a new triangle:

$$\underline{\Psi} : \underline{U} \oplus \tau\underline{W_1} \to \underline{E_{W_1}} \oplus \underline{U} \to \underline{W_1} \to (\underline{U} \oplus \tau\underline{W_1})[1].$$

Applying Lemma 4.7 to the triangles $\underline{\Sigma}$ and $\underline{\Psi}$, we get

$$\underline{\Theta} : \underline{U} \oplus \tau\underline{W_1} \to \underline{W_2} \oplus \underline{E_{W_1}} \to \underline{V} \to (\underline{U} \oplus \tau\underline{W_1})[1].$$

It is easy to see that we have the following equality

$$\delta_{\underline{\Theta}}(X) = \delta_{\underline{\Sigma}}(X) + \delta_{\underline{\Psi}}(X) = \delta_{\underline{\Sigma}}(X) + \delta_{\underline{\Sigma_{W_1}}}(\underline{X}) = \delta_{\underline{\Sigma}}(X) + \delta_{\underline{\Sigma_{X_i}}}(X)$$

for each $X \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$. Therefore $\delta_{\underline{\Sigma}} < \delta_{\underline{\Theta}} \le \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}$. Repeating this procedure, we obtain the required triangle noting that this process stops since R is of finite representation type. □

Theorem 4.12. [16, Paragraph (3.3)] *Let R be of finite representation type which satisfies $(*)$. Suppose that $\underline{X} \cong \underline{X}[2]$ for each indecomposable $\underline{X} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. Then $\underline{M} \le_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N}$ if and only if $\underline{M} \le_{st} \underline{N}$ for Cohen-Macaulay R-modules M and N with $[\underline{M}] = [\underline{N}]$ in $K_0(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$.*

Proof. As mentioned in Remark 4.5, $\underline{M} \le_{st} \underline{N}$ implies that $\underline{M} \le_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N}$.

To show the converse, we assume that $\underline{M} \le_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N}$ and they have no common direct summand. For each indecomposable Cohen-Macaulay module X, we set $r(X) = min\{\delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X), \mu(\underline{N}, \underline{X})\}$ where $\delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X) := \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X)/\delta_{\underline{\Sigma_X}}(X)$. We consider the following set of isomorphism classes of non free indecomposable Cohen-Macaulay modules:

$$\mathcal{F} = \{X \mid r(X) > 0\}/ <\cong> .$$

Then we have the case that both a module X and its syzygy ΩX appear in $\mathcal{F}$. We choose X (or ΩX) in $\mathcal{F}$ if $r(\Omega X) < r(X)$ (or $r(X) < r(\Omega X)$) and let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set consisting of them. Let $N_1 = \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{G}} X^{r(X)}$, $N_2 = \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{G}} X^{\mu(\underline{N},\underline{X}) - r(X)}$ and $N_3 = \bigoplus_{X \notin \mathcal{G}} X^{\mu(\underline{N},\underline{X})}$. Then $\underline{N_1} \oplus \underline{N_2} \oplus \underline{N_3} \cong \underline{N}$ in $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$. Since R is an isolated singularity, we can take an Auslander-Reiten triangle:

$$\underline{\Sigma_X} : \tau\underline{X} \to \underline{E_X} \to \underline{X} \to \tau\underline{X}[1].$$

Consider a triangle $\underline{\Sigma}$ which is a direct sum of $r(X)$ copies of triangles $\underline{\Sigma_X}$ where X runs through all modules in $\mathcal{G}$:

$$\underline{\Sigma} : \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{G}} (\tau\underline{X})^{r(X)} \to \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{G}} \underline{E_X}^{r(X)} \to \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{G}} \underline{X}^{r(X)} \to \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{G}} (\tau\underline{X}[1])^{r(X)}.$$

Here we note that $\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{G}} \underline{X}^{r(X)} \cong \underline{N_1}$.

First we claim that

Claim 1: $\underline{N}$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{G}} (\underline{X} \oplus \tau\underline{X})^{r(X)}$.

According to Proposition 3.3, we have the following irredundant expression in $\mathrm{G}(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$:

$$[\underline{N}] - [\underline{M}] = \sum_{i}^{n} \delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X_i) \cdot ([\underline{X_i}] + [\tau\underline{X_i}] - [\underline{E_{X_i}}]). \tag{4.2}$$

Since M and N have no common direct summand, $\underline{N}$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\bigoplus_i^n (\underline{X_i} \oplus \tau\underline{X_i})^{\delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X_i)}$. Thus, for each indecomposable direct summand N' of N, there exists i such that $N' \cong \underline{X_i}$ or $\tau\underline{X_i}$, so that $N' \in \mathcal{F}$. We remark that $\underline{X_i} \cong \tau\underline{X_i} \cong \underline{X_i}[-1]$ or $\underline{X_i}[-1] \cong \tau\underline{X_i}$ (Remark 2.4, 3.2(2)). If $\underline{X_i} \ncong \tau\underline{X_i}$ then $\mu(\underline{N}, \underline{N'}) \le \delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X_i)$. And if $\underline{X_i} \ncong \tau\underline{X_i}$ then $\mu(\underline{N}, \underline{N'}) \le 2\delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X_i)$. Hence, if $\underline{N'} \ncong \tau\underline{N'}$, $\mu(\underline{N}, \underline{N'}) = r(N')$ and if $\underline{N'} \cong \tau\underline{N'}$ then $\mu(\underline{N}, \underline{N'}) \le 2r(N')$. By the choice of modules in $\mathcal{G}$, the claim follows. □

For the triangle $\underline{\Sigma}$, we have an inequality $\delta_{\underline{\Sigma}}(X) = \sum r(X)\delta_{\underline{\Sigma_X}}(X) \leq \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X)$ for each $X \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$. By virtue of Lemma 4.11, we have a triangle $\underline{\Phi} : \underline{Z} \to \underline{Y} \to \underline{N_1} \to \underline{Z}[1]$ such that $\delta_{\underline{\Sigma}} \leq \delta_{\underline{\phi}} \leq \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}$ and $\delta_{\underline{\Phi}}(Y) = \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(Y)$. Next we claim that

Claim 2: $\delta_{\underline{\Phi}}(U) = \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(U)$ for each $U \in \mathrm{CM}(R)$.

Seeing the construction of $\underline{\Phi}$ in Lemma 4.11, $[\underline{N_1}] + [\underline{Z}] - [\underline{Y}]$ can be taken as a constituent of (4.2), say

$$[\underline{N}] - [\underline{M}] = [\underline{N_1}] + [\underline{Z}] - [\underline{Y}] + \sum_{i}^{n'} \delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X'_i) \cdot ([\underline{X'_i}] + [\tau\underline{X'_i}] - [\underline{E_{X'_i}}])$$

in $\mathrm{G}(\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R))$. Since $\delta_{\underline{\Phi}}(Y) = \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(Y)$, for each indecomposable direct summand Y' of Y, $Y' \ncong \underline{X'_i}$ and $\underline{X'_i}[-1]$, so that $Y' \ncong \tau\underline{X'_i}$ and $\tau\underline{X'_i}[-1]$. Hence $\underline{Y}$ and $\bigoplus(\underline{X'_i} \oplus \tau\underline{X'_i})^{\delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X'_i)}$ have no common nonzero direct summand. Note that

$$\underline{N} \oplus \underline{Y} \oplus \bigoplus \underline{E_{X'_i}}^{\delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X'_i)} \cong \underline{M} \oplus \underline{N_1} \oplus \underline{Z} \oplus \bigoplus(\underline{X'_i} \oplus \tau\underline{X'_i})^{\delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X'_i)}.$$

By *Claim 1*, one can show that $\underline{N}$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $N_1 \oplus Z$. Thus we have

$$\bigoplus \underline{E_{X'_i}}^{\delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X'_i)} \cong \bigoplus(\underline{X'_i} \oplus \tau\underline{X'_i})^{\delta'_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(X'_i)}.$$

Hence $\underline{N} \oplus \underline{Y} \cong \underline{M} \oplus \underline{N_1} \oplus \underline{Z}$, so that $\delta_{\underline{\Phi}} = \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}$. ☐

Since $0 \leq \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}} - \delta_{\underline{\Phi}} = \delta_{\underline{M}\oplus\underline{Z},\underline{N_2}\oplus\underline{N_3}\oplus\underline{Y}}$, we see that $\underline{M} \oplus \underline{Z} \leq_{\underline{hom}} \underline{N_2} \oplus \underline{N_3} \oplus \underline{Y}$. Moreover the claim implies that $\delta_{\underline{M}\oplus\underline{Z},\underline{N_2}\oplus\underline{N_3}\oplus\underline{Y}}(\underline{N_2} \oplus \underline{N_3} \oplus \underline{Y}) = \delta_{\underline{M},\underline{N}}(\underline{N_2} \oplus \underline{N_3} \oplus \underline{Y}) - \delta_{\underline{\Phi}}(\underline{N_2} \oplus \underline{N_3} \oplus \underline{Y}) = 0$. By Proposition 3.5, we have $\underline{M} \oplus \underline{Z} \cong \underline{N_2} \oplus \underline{N_3} \oplus \underline{Y}$. Therefore, the triangle $\underline{\Phi} : \underline{Z} \to \underline{Y} \to \underline{N_1} \to \underline{Z}[1]$ induces a triangle

$$\underline{Z} \to \underline{N_2} \oplus \underline{N_3} \oplus \underline{Y} \cong \underline{M} \oplus \underline{Z} \to \underline{N_1} \oplus \underline{N_2} \oplus \underline{N_3} \cong \underline{N} \to \underline{Z}[1].$$

This makes the stable degeneration $\underline{M} \leq_{st} \underline{N}$. ☐

Proof of Theorem 4.6. As mentioned in Remark 3.2 (3), R is of finite representation type which satisfies $(*)$. Since R is a hypersurface, each Cohen-Macaulay module is periodic of period at most 2 (cf. [11, Proposition 7.2]). Hence, it follows from Theorem 4.12 that the stable degeneration order is equivalent to the stable hom order. Therefore, by direct calculations of the stable hom order, we get the assertion. ☐

In [4], the author also investigate the case that the dimension is even. The essential part is the following.

Proposition 4.13. [4, Corollary 2.12., Proposition 3.10.] *Let $R = k[[x]]/(x^{n+1})$. Then the stable degeneration order coincides with the triangle order on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$.*

Proof. We give an outline of a proof for the convenience of the reader.

Since R is artinian, $\underline{M}$ stable degenerates to $\underline{N}$ if and only if $M \oplus P$ degenerates to $N \oplus Q$ for some free R-modules P, Q. As shown in [4, Corollary 2.12.], the degeneration order and the extension order are equivalent on $\mathrm{CM}(R)$. That is, $N \oplus Q$ is obtained from $M \oplus P$ by iterative degenerations by extensions. Therefore $\underline{N}$ is obtained from $\underline{M}$ by iterative degenerations by triangles, so that $\underline{M} \leq_{tri} \underline{N}$. ☐

Proposition 4.14. [14, Corollary 6.6] *Let R_1 and R_2 be isolated singularities. Suppose there is a k-linear equivalence $F : \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R_1) \to \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R_2)$ of triangulated categories. Then, for $\underline{M}$, $\underline{N} \in \underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R_1)$, $\underline{M}$ stably degenerates to $\underline{N}$ if and only if $F(\underline{M})$ stably degenerates to $F(\underline{N})$.*

The following lemma is known as the Knörrer's periodicity (cf. [11, Theorem 12.10]).

Lemma 4.15. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 and let $S = k[[x_0, x_1, \cdots, x_n]]$ be a formal power series ring. For a non-zero element $f \in (x_0, x_1, \cdots, x_n)S$, we consider the two rings $R = S/(f)$ and $R^\sharp = S[[y, z]]/(f + y^2 + z^2)$. Then the stable categories $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$ and $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R^\sharp)$ are equivalent as triangulated categories.*

Summing up these results, we have the main result of the paper.

Theorem 4.16. *Let R be a simple singularity of type (A_n). Then the following hold on $\underline{\mathrm{CM}}(R)$.*

1. *If R is of odd dimension then the stable degeneration order coincides with the stable hom order.*
2. *If R is of even dimension, then the stable degeneration order coincides with the triangle order.*

Proof. Combining Knörrer's periodicity (Lemma 4.15) with Proposition 4.14, we have only to deal with the case $\dim R = 1$ to show (1) and the case $\dim R = 0$ to show (2). Hence, by Theorem 4.6 and Propostion 4.13, we obtain the assertion. ☐

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author express his deepest gratitude to Tokuji Araya and Yuji Yoshino for valuable discussions and helpful comments.

REFERENCES

[1] K. BONGARTZ, *On degenerations and extensions of finite-dimensional modules.* Adv. Math. **121** (1996), 245–287.

[2] R.-O. BUCHWEITZ, *Maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules and Tate-cohomology over Gorenstein rings.* Preprint (1986), `http://hdl.handle.net/1807/16682`.

[3] D. HAPPEL, *Triangulated categories in the representation theory of finite-dimensional algebras*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series **119**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988. x+208 pp.

[4] N. HIRAMATSU and Y. YOSHINO, *Examples of degenerations of Cohen-Macaulay modules*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **141** (2013), no. 7, 2275–2288.

[5] N. HIRAMATSU, *Degenerations of graded Cohen-Macaulay modules.* To appear in J. Commut. Algebra.

[6] O. IYAMA and R. TAKAHASHI, *Tilting and cluster tilting for quotient singularities*, Math. Ann. **356** (2013), no. 3, 1065–1105.

[7] B. JENSEN, X, SU and A. ZIMMERMANN, *Degenerations for derived categories.* J. Pure Appl. Algebra **198** (2005), no. 1-3, 281–295.

[8] I. REITEN and M. VAN DEN BERGH, *Noetherian hereditary abelian categories satisfying Serre duality.* J. Amer. Math. Soc. **15** (2002), no. 2, 295–366.

[9] C. RIEDTMANN, *Degenerations for representations of quivers with relations.* Ann. Scient. École Norm. Sup. 4^e sèrie **19** (1986), 275–301.

[10] M. SAORIN and A. ZIMMERMANN, *An axiomatic approach for degenerations in triangulated categories.* Preprint.

[11] Y. YOSHINO, *Cohen-Macaulay Modules over Cohen-Macaulay Rings*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series **146**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990. viii+177 pp.

[12] Y. YOSHINO, *On degenerations of Cohen-Macaulay modules.* J. Algebra **248** (2002), 272–290.

[13] Y. YOSHINO, *On degenerations of modules.* J. Algebra **278** (2004), 217–226.

[14] Y. YOSHINO, *Stable degenerations of Cohen-Macaulay modules*, J. Algebra **332** (2011), 500–521.

[15] G. ZWARA, *A degeneration-like order for modules.* Arch. Math. **71** (1998), 437–444.

[16] G. ZWARA, *Degenerations for modules over representation-finite algebras.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **127** (1999), 1313–1322.

[17] G. ZWARA, *Degenerations of finite-dimensional modules are given by extensions.* Compositio Math. **121** (2000), 205–218.

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION, KURE NATIONAL COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY, 2-2-11, AGAMINAMI, KURE HIROSHIMA, 737-8506 JAPAN
E-mail address: `hiramatsu@kure-nct.ac.jp`